

Chair VerLinden called the meeting to order at 4:02 pm on Tuesday, March 29, 2011, Nelson Hall East, Room 102 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

Members Present: Altschul, August, Berman, Blake, Cheyne, Craig, Ellerd, Faulk, Flashman, Goodman, Heise, Kelly, Knox, Madar, Mola, Mortazavi, Moyer, Nordstrom, Powell, Reiss, Rizzardi, Shaeffer, Thobaben, Tripp, Van Duzer, VerLinden, Wilyer, Yarnall, Yzaguirre.

Members Absent: Crowder-Fiore, Richmond, Rodriguez, Snyder, Whitlatch.

Guests: S. Smith, Ayoob, Lee, Burges.

1. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of March 8, 2011

M/S/U (Mortazavi/Van Duzer) to approve the minutes from the meeting of March 8, 2011 as written.

2. Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair

The end of the year reception for the Senate will be combined with a reception honoring this year's Faculty Awards recipients. It will be held on Tuesday, May 3, at 5 pm. Senators should save the date and watch for further announcements.

3. Reports of Standing Committees, Statewide Senators, and Ex-officio Members (see also written reports included in the packet)

General Faculty (Powell): A General Faculty election is underway; voting concludes on Wednesday.

Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) (Moyer): The full ICC met today and continued its work on curriculum matters. Revisions are being made to curriculum forms to make the forms clearer and easier to complete. The ICC is refining its work processes and using features of SharePoint to help its track. It was noted that at the last Senate meeting, a question was raised about a curriculum item from Engineering that was on the consent calendar. After further consultation with the Engineering department, it was determined that the original proposal from the department was in error. The department will re-submit a corrected proposal.

Statewide Senate (Cheyne): Senator Cheyne will forward a report to the Senate via email on the recent plenary session. The ASCSU passed two resolutions that ask campus senates to

consider and act upon. One is a condemnation of the Board of Education in Idaho for suspending the Academic Senate and the other is a resolution expressing solidarity with faculty members in Wisconsin and other states where collective bargaining rights are being challenged. Senator Cheyne will forward these resolutions to the Senate Executive Committee.

Chair VerLinden announced that the ASCSU has forwarded two names to the Governor for nomination for Faculty Trustee and one of the final candidates is Senator Cheyne. Congratulations were offered.

Associated Students (AS) (Wilyer): The AS election process is underway and it looks like it will be a competitive election. AS is concluding its budget process and the budget will be put to a vote. The search for a Student Trustee has been extended. Faculty senators were asked to encourage students who would be good candidates for this position to apply.

Senate Finance Officer (Mortazavi): In addition to his report in the packet, Senator Mortazavi reported that HSU's final budget reduction from the CSU was \$2 million less than what was planned for. (see budget update from Provost Snyder under written reports submitted for March 29 meeting)

Administrative Affairs (Nordstrom): The CSU did not make reductions equally across the board; smaller campuses such as HSU were given lower reductions as a way to help them. Given the uncertainties about the budget and the future in general, the vice presidents and the president agreed not to re-visit the HSU budget for 2011/2012 at this time.

It was noted that President Richmond's advocacy for HSU and a differential budget reduction was successful and effective.

4. Consent Calendar

The following consent calendar item was questioned:

10-314: COMM 110: Intercollegiate Speech and Debate. Change C-class from C-20 to C-78. (C-78 has no specified WTUs, so the department negotiates the WTUs directly with the Dean. In this case, the change to C-78 will help correct WTU errors on the FAD report which currently lists the faculty as receiving 9 or more units for the pair of courses when the correct WTU is actually 6 for the pair of courses.)

Q: C-classification 'C-78' has no specified number of WTUs, so it must be negotiated – this could benefit or hurt a faculty member. Is there another C-classification that could be used? A: No, there isn't.

Following discussion of C-classifications (history, difficulty of finding correct c-classifications, etc.) voting occurred and curriculum item 10-314 **PASSED** with 1 Abstention.

The remaining items on the consent calendar were approved without objection:

0-060: WLDF 450: Principles of Wildlife Diseases
10-313: COMM 310: Intercollegiate Speech and Debate
10-320: Social Work BA
10-321: EDUC 313: Education for Action
10-322: EMP 499: NRPI Directed Study
10-323: EMP 699: NRPI Directed Study
10-324: EMP 482: NRPI Internship
10-325: EMP 690: NRPI Thesis
10-326: EMP 695: NRPI Field Research.

5. TIME CERTAIN: 4:15-4:30 – Open Forum for the Campus Community

Senator Flashman shared his concerns with the Senate about the Senate's deliberative processes and how they have deteriorated over time. Senator Flashman cited several instances of the Senate's discussion of issues (shared governance, lack of confidence in the president, appointment of the provost, bill or particulars) which were never brought to a conclusion. The ICC Constitution was rushed through the Senate and those who wanted to deliberate were shut down. The Senate seems to be thinking less and running faster. The Senate needs to slow down and do some critical thinking.

6. Presentation on Campus Data and Update on GRIP

Jyoti Rawal (Assoc. Dean, Retention) and Jacqueline Nagatsuka (Director, Institutional Research) gave a presentation on the Graduation Rate Improvement Program (GRIP). (PowerPoint presentation available at: <http://www.humboldt.edu/senate/agendas/packets/11-03-29packet.html>)

GRIP is charged with increasing graduation rates, specifically increasing the graduation rates of underrepresented students at HSU by 15% by 2015, without additional budget resources. Data comparing HSU to the CSU system was provided and explained. Data shows that 40.3% of freshmen don't graduate; the campus needs to help these students meet their goals. GRIP is focused on creating a culture that supports timely completion of a degree. Service centers on campus (Advising, Career, and Learning) are changing their services and letting students know they are there to help them plan for graduation. Various things are being tried to find the right 'best practices' for HSU. The Plan itself is evolving as certain activities are found not to work or be the best fit, and some items from the plan have been consolidated into other projects. Student learning outcomes are being tracked in student services. Students who have left the

university are being interviewed to find out why they didn't return. In addition, interviews and focus groups will be conducted with students on campus, to help better understand the qualitative side of the data.

Comments/Questions:

The campus should provide financial incentives for students to finish in four years, e.g., establish a policy that guarantees freshmen students the same tuition rate for four years. And students need to be informed about how costly it will be to stay at HSU beyond four years.

Putting the responsibility on the students to plan is part of changing the culture.

There are not enough faculty advisors.

One of the methods that GRIP should consider is providing additional sections of courses, especially in General Education.

Some of the basic findings of what works in student retention have not changed since the 1970's. One of those is the ability of students to get to know their professors and to have small classes.

It would be reasonable for the university to invest in a software program that would help map out a student's four years, based on choice of courses. It needs to have a user-friendly interface.

Many of the classes that first time freshmen take are taught by lecturers. Lecturers do not advise students and often teach very large classes where it is impossible to learn all of the names of the students. There is nothing being done with this part of the workforce that directly interacts with these students. In addition, it is reprehensible to expect an eighteen year old to know what they want to do when they enter HSU. The university should be providing them with an opportunity to explore and expand their horizons.

All stakeholders need to be involved in this program, including lecturers. The campus needs to find out from students what they want; it varies by type of student and it is difficult to generalize. For example, there are some underrepresented students who are seeking primarily to get a degree and a job.

7. Final Discussion on Draft documents for Proposed University Senate

Senator Knox clarified that at the last Senate meeting, it was agreed that this would be the final discussion of the proposed University Senate Constitution and the proposed University Senate Bylaws. The March 17 version of these documents is still the version being discussed.

A two-page handout was provided that listed changes to the Constitution of the University Senate.

M/S (Thobaben/Cheyne) that the Academic Senate recommends the proposed ballot (handed out at the meeting).

Discussion:

- There is no date on the ballot. Senator Powell said that he will be sending the drafts of the documents to the AAUP for review and will be calling a meeting of the General Faculty to discuss them. It is premature to set a date for the election.
- If someone votes “No” on the first item on the ballot, they don’t need to vote on the other two items.

Senator Knox requested that the Senate discuss Resolution #28-10/11-FAC first, before discussing the ballot.

M/S/U (Flashman/Goodman) to table the motion on the proposed ballot until after the discussion of the proposed documents.

It was clarified that all voting members of the senate should vote on these procedural issues. Voting occurred and the motion PASSED unanimously.

M/S (Cheyne/Thobaben) to place Resolution #28-10/11-FAC on the floor with its attachments.

Resolution On Proposed University Senate Documents #28-10/11-FAC – March 29, 2011

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that the attached *Constitution of the General Faculty of Humboldt State University*, as revised March 29, 2011, be submitted to the General Faculty of Humboldt State University for a ratification vote; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that the proposed *Constitution of the University Senate of Humboldt State University* and the proposed *Bylaws and Rules of Procedure of the University Senate of Humboldt State University* be submitted to the General Faculty of Humboldt State University for a ratification vote; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that should the Revision to the *Constitution of the General Faculty of Humboldt State University*, the [use titles from documents] proposed *Constitution of the University Senate of Humboldt State University* and the proposed *Bylaws and Rules of Procedure of the University Senate of Humboldt State* be ratified by a majority vote of the General Faculty in residence that the revised constitutions and bylaws become effective at the beginning of the Spring semester 2012; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that should any of these documents, the *Constitution of the General Faculty of Humboldt State University*, the proposed *Constitution of the University Senate of Humboldt State University* and the proposed *Bylaws and Rules of Procedure of the University Senate of the Humboldt State University*, NOT be ratified by a majority of the faculty voting, then the current General Faculty Constitution (Appendix E of the Faculty Handbook) including Article IV (The Academic Senate), and the Bylaws and Rules of the Academic Senate (Appendix F of the Faculty Handbook) shall remain in force until such time as revised or amended by the General Faculty.

Rationale: In its February 2, 2010 report, *Building the Capacity for Change: Improving the structure and culture of Decision making at HSU*, the Cabinet for Institutional Change made specific recommendations with regard to campus governance at HSU (Section 2 of the Focus Areas). In the background discussion the Cabinet provided, they noted that "...all constituencies should be directly involved in developing policy that reflects shared goals, ..." (p.9). After review of the report, the Academic Senate referred the governance issues in the document to the Faculty Affairs Committee for review. Based on a report from that committee, the Senate charged the committee to "begin articulating, in written form and to the wider HSU community, a new Senate structure for HSU, a *University Senate* built on the model of the Senate at SDSU..." (April 2, 2010). The Faculty Affairs committee has worked on that charge, conferring frequently with the Senate and holding Town Hall meetings during the fall semester to gather input.

The Academic Senate of Humboldt State University was created by the Constitution of the General Faculty. It serves as the primary voice of the faculty and is given its powers by the General Faculty Constitution. It is not a body of the University; it is a body of the General Faculty. The HSU Academic Senate does include administrators, staff and students, though in small numbers and with limited voting privileges. However, only the faculty can vote to change the General Faculty Constitution, and in doing so dissolve the Academic Senate and replace it with a University Senate.

Discussion:

Concerns were expressed about discussing a document [Revision to the GF Constitution] that was just received a few hours prior to the meeting. All documents for Senate meetings should be available on Friday, prior to the meeting on Tuesday.

It was agreed that this would be a first reading of Resolution #28-10/11-FAC "Resolution on Proposed University Senate Documents."

At the last Senate meeting a motion was passed that this meeting would be the final discussion of the Draft University Senate Constitution and the Draft University Senate Bylaws. Those documents have not been revised since the last discussion.

In general, what has been accomplished by these documents includes: reduction the size of the senate, provision for more representation from staff and students, requirement that all senators engage in service on senate committees, and placing the university budget committee under the senate. In addition, the prose style of the new documents is better and the statements of purpose are improved and are clearer.

Draft University Senate Bylaws: Section 1.593 – Remove "Secretary" and change to Chair of the Senate.

Draft University Senate Constitution Preamble: Section 1.0 – Q: What does "administrators of high rank" mean in the last sentence? A: According to current procedures, it refers to deans and above.

Draft University Senate Constitution: Section 1.0 – This should include lecturers, not just 'full-time' faculty. It was agreed to change to "General Faculty in residence" (as defined in the General Faculty Constitution).

Resolution #28-10/11/FAC: It is still premature to resolve anything about the General Faculty Constitution.

Senator Knox reviewed the 2-p. handout of changes to the Draft University Senate Constitution (3/17/11). These are the only changes that have been made to the 3/17/11 draft. The highlighted portion of Section 1.0, *Shared Governance* was added; this is language from the General Faculty Constitution.

Section 5.1 – It was suggested that "in residence" be added to General Faculty.

Section 5.1 – It was suggested that the qualification of two years of serving on the university senate be deleted. It was noted that the General Faculty Constitution has no succession for president and the succession of officers in the university senate is unclear.

- Two years of service on the senate is a critical qualification. Faculty need to have some assurance that the individual knows something about the operation of the senate.
- As it stands, there would be no one qualified for the next two years.

M/S/P (Mola/Flashman) to rescind the motion made at the March 8 Academic Senate Meeting that stated that the March 29 senate meeting would be the final discussion of the drafts of the University Senate Constitution and Bylaws. Voting occurred and PASSED with 1 Abstention.

- The requirement of two years of experience can be addressed so that the new senate can be constituted, e.g., requiring two years on a faculty senate in lieu of service on the university senate. Having some knowledge of how the body operates is critical.
- This section was re-drafted – the qualifications of the General Faculty President should be in the General Faculty Constitution, not in the University Senate Constitution.

The Faculty Affairs Committee will discuss this further and bring it back to the senate next week.

Senators were asked to carefully read and the documents for the next senate meeting.

M/S/P (Knox/Mortazavi) to hold a special Senate meeting in one week, to consider all three documents. Voting occurred and motion PASSED with 1 No vote and 2 Abstentions.

M (Flashman) to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 5:53 pm.